Public Works (1913) Department.

2-JAN 1914

G.O. No. 697-98-I

DATED 13.12. **1913.**

The Notes
in this G.O. have been printed.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Improvements to the Peranai Regulator Periyar System. - Sanctioning a revised estimate amounting to Rs 75695 inclusive of establishment charges etc. and ordering that a copy of the Proceedings be forwarded to the Govt of India.

[P. W. 9. 2,000—2-10-12.]

Indexed.

[illegible] 13/12

[illegible]

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

IRRIGATION.
ACCOUNT.

Recd.	1914	*Enclosures*
Regd.		*Spare copies*

G.O. No. 697 I., 13th December 1913.

Improvements to the Peranai Regulator, Periyar System

Sanctioning a revised estimate amounting to Rs. 75,695 inclusive of establishment charges for — and ordering that a copy of the proceedings be forwarded to the Government of India.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Irrigation.
Account.

READ—the following papers :—

I

G.O. No. 387 I., dated 21st September 1909.

II

G.O. Nos. 124–25 I., dated 24th February 1913.

III

G.O. No. 244 I., dated 30th April 1913.

IV

Letter—from M. O'BRIEN, Esq., Executive Engineer, Madura Division.
To—the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle.
Dated—the 28th June 1913.
No.—842-S.E.

With reference to your Memoranda Nos. 1531 and 2552, dated 17th February 1913 and 19th March 1913, respectively, I have the honour to state that the total outlay incurred and charged to the old estimate sanctioned in G.O. No. 266 I., dated 26th June 1909, estimate Rs. 14,000, C.R. No 138 of 1909–10, including portion of the outlay of Rs. 3,740–0–2 incurred and subsequently written back from the estimate "Repairs to Peranai head works" (Rs. 2,610—C.R. No. 275 of 1908–09) is Rupees 6,275–8–4, the details of which may be summed up as follows :—

	RS.	A.	P.
Cartage	24	9	0
Maistri's pay	30	0	0
Cement	155	15	4
Conveyance of shafts	50	6	6
Masonry	592	8	0
Ten sprocket wheels	1,157	12	7
Twenty-five pedestals	2,610	9	7
Cutstone dressed at site, 884·38 cubic feet	1,081	7	7
Cutstone rough, 167·41 cubic feet	188	5	5
Cutstone undressed, 472·55 cubic feet	383	14	4
	6,275	8	4

It will be seen that some of these charges can be transferred to the new estimate, with the exception of charge for stones at site and that for conveyance of shafts. This latter is a recent charge and the shafts are for the new gearings. In preparing the new estimate, the piers were taken as they actually were, and provision was made for raising each individually to the height required. Some of these piers had been already raised to a certain height under the old estimate In the new one, provision was made for simply continuing the raising from where it had stopped. The new estimate therefore makes no provision for work done under the old and if the expenditure incurred under the old one be charged to the new estimate, the result will be a large excess of Rs. 4,571.

The new estimate sanctioned in G.O. No. 124 I., dated 24th March 1913 (C.R. No. 81 of 1913–14) for Rs. 57,700 cannot therefore be considered as one superseding

the old estimate, and the only thing that seems to me to be possible is to close the old estimate writing back to the new one the value of the stones at site and the conveyance charges of the shaft as originally contemplated in your No. 1531, dated 17th February 1913. The iron articles, *i.e.*, girders, etc., charged to the old estimate and now lying at site will be treated as surplus materials and disposed of in the manner suggested in this office No. 721-S.E., dated 7th June 1913. I request the favour of your very early orders on the subject.

No. 998-C.E./664 N., dated 10th July 1913.

Forwarded to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation for orders.

2. A reference has been made to the other Executive Engineers in this circle as to whether the girders now lying at site of the regulator are required by them. Their replies are awaited.

S. B. MURRAY,
Superintending Engineer, VI Circle.

V

Memorandum No. 2798/13-1, dated 2nd August 1913.

With reference to his endorsement No. 998-C.E., dated 10th July 1913, regarding the estimate for raising and altering the gearing arrangements of the Peranai regulator, the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, is informed that it is irregular to close the old estimate as suggested by the Executive Engineer, the estimate sanctioned in G.O. No. 244 I., dated 30th April 1913, being in supersession of the estimate sanctioned in 1909. The Superintending Engineer is therefore requested to submit a revised estimate providing for the charges already incurred on the estimate of 1909, with full and clear explanation of the circumstances under which the expenditure on the old estimate of 1909 was incurred and why it was not included in the estimate of Rs. 57,000 submitted with the Superintending Engineer's letter 1579-C.E., dated 27th November 1912.

(By Order.)

F. E. MORGAN,
Asst. Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

To the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle.

VI

Reminder to the Supg. Engr., VI Circle, dated 10th October 1913.
From the " VI " " 21st " " No. 1519-C.E./664 N.

VII

Letter—from S. B. MURRAY, Esq., Superintending Engineer, VI Circle.
To—the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
Dated—Trichinopoly, the 8th November 1913.
No.—1615-C.E./664 N.

I have the honour to forward herewith for the sanction of the Government a revised estimate, amounting to Rs. 62,300, for "raising the platform, altering the gearing and roller arrangements and shifting the bridge of the Peranai regulator." The necessity for the revision is explained in the report accompanying the estimate.

ENCLOSURES.

(1)

Report to accompany the revised estimate for "raising the platform, altering the gearing and roller arrangements and shifting the bridge of Peranai regulator."

	RS.
Amount of original estimate	57,700
Do. of revised estimate	62,300
Balance requiring sanction ...	4,600

As the gearings of the lift shutters of the Peranai regulator, Periyār system, were working unsatisfactorily, certain improvements were carried out in 1908–09 to the two shore spans on the right bank of the river. As these improvements were considered satisfactory, an estimate of Rs. 14,000 for altering the gearing arrangements of the remaining eight spans was sanctioned in G.O. No. 266 I., dated 26th June 1909 (Circle Reg. No. 138 of 1909–10). On this estimate an expenditure of Rs. 6,275–8–4 was incurred as detailed below :—

	RS.	A.	P.
(1) Cartage	24	9	0
(2) Maistri's pay	30	0	0
(3) Cement	155	15	4
(4) Conveyance of shafts	50	6	6
(5) Masonry	592	8	0
(6) Iron articles supplied by Workshops and remaining at site.	3,768	6	2
(7) Cutstone dressed at site, 884·38 cubic feet...	1,081	7	7
(8) Cutstone rough, 167·41 cubic feet	188	5	5
(9) Cutstone undressed, 472·55 cubic feet	383	14	4
Total ...	6,275	8	4

When this expenditure had been incurred, work was ordered to be stopped for the reasons given in Chief Engineer's note R.O.C. No. 1292/09, dated 4th February 1913. A fresh estimate of Rs. 57,700 was prepared and sanctioned in G.O. No. 244 I., dated 30th April 1913. This estimate was to supersede the old one, but no provision was made in it for the expenditure incurred under the old one, as when the new estimate was submitted it was presumed that the old estimate would be closed. To make up for this omission this revised estimate is submitted for sanction. It provides for all the charges incurred under the old estimate except those included under items (4), (7), (8) and (9). The shafts included in item (4) were those provided for in the Rs. 57,700 estimate and their conveyance is a proper charge to that estimate. The stone in items (7), (8) and (9) can all be used on the work in building the masonry provided for in the Rs. 57,700 estimate.

---

(2)

Estimate Form—Comparative statement of differences.

Description of work.	Original estimate. Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	Revised estimate. Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	More.	Less.	Explanation of difference.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Raising the platform, altering the gearing and roller arrangements and shifting the bridge of Peranai regulator.			RS.			RS.	RS.		
Unaffected items as per estimate already sanctioned in G.O. No. 244 I. dated 30th April 1913.	..	..	57,700	..	..	57,700	..	..	
Outlay incurred and charged to old estimate sanctioned for Rs. 14,000 in G.O. No. 266 I., dated 26th June 1909.	..	..	...	..	..	4,572	4572	..	Explanation for the provision of this item is given in the report accompanying the estimate.
Unforeseen works ..	..	..	..	..	..	28	28	..	
Total ..	..	..	57,700	..	..	62,300	4,600	..	
Amount sanctioned in G.O. No. 244 I., dated 30th April 1913.	..	..	..	..	..	57,700	..	..	
Net excess over the original sanction.	..	..	..	..	..	4,600	..	..	

30th October 1913.

M. O'Brien,
Executive Engineer, Madura Division.

VIII

Endorsement by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, No. 2793/13-2, dated 3rd December 1913.

Submitted to Government.

2. In the circumstances explained in the report, the revised estimate submitted by the Superintending Engineer in his letter last read above is recommended for sanction.

H. E. CLERK,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

To the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department (Irrigation Branch).

Order—No. 697 I., dated 13th December 1913.

The revised estimate amounting to Rs. 62,300 for "works" or Rs. 75,695 including establishment charges for improvements to the Peranai regulator, Periyâr system, is sanctioned in supersession of the estimate of Rs. 70,971 sanctioned in G.O. No. 244 I., dated 30th April 1913.

2. The sanction accorded in paragraph 1 is registered as No. 132 I. of 1913-14 and will expire on 31st March 1915.

3. Ordered that a copy of these Proceedings be forwarded to the Government of India for information, with reference to their letter No. 520 I., dated 4th April 1913.

[Here enter No. 698 I., dated 13th December 1913.]

(True Extract.)

Under Secretary to Government,
Irrigation Branch.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
,, Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, with estimates.
,, Accountant-General.
,, Financial Department.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

IRRIGATION.
ACCOUNT.

Recd.	1914	*Enclosures*	
Regd.		*Spare copies*	

G.O. Nos. 697, 698 I., 13th December 1913.

Improvements to the Peranai Regulator, Periyar System

Sanctioning a revised estimate amounting to Rs. 75,695 inclusive of establishment charges for — and ordering that a copy of the proceedings be forwarded to the Government of India.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Irrigation.
Account.

READ—the following papers :—

I

G.O. No. 387 I., dated 21st September 1909.

II

G.O. Nos. 124–25 I., dated 24th February 1913.

III

G.O. No. 244 I., dated 30th April 1913.

IV

Letter—from M. O'BRIEN, Esq., Executive Engineer, Madura Division.
To—the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle.
Dated—the 28th June 1913.
No.—842-S.E.

With reference to your Memoranda Nos. 1531 and 2552, dated 17th February 1913 and 19th March 1913, respectively, I have the honour to state that the total outlay incurred and charged to the old estimate sanctioned in G.O. No. 266 I., dated 26th June 1909, estimate Rs. 14,000, C.R. No 138 of 1909–10, including portion of the outlay of Rs. 3,740–0–2 incurred and subsequently written back from the estimate "Repairs to Peranai head works" (Rs. 2,610—C.R. No. 275 of 1908–09) is Rupees 6,275–8–4, the details of which may be summed up as follows :—

	RS.	A.	P.
Cartage	24	9	0
Maistri's pay	30	0	0
Cement	155	15	4
Conveyance of shafts	50	6	6
Masonry	592	8	0
Ten sprocket wheels	1,157	12	7
Twenty-five pedestals	2,610	9	7
Cutstone dressed at site, 884·38 cubic feet	1,081	7	7
Cutstone rough, 167·41 cubic feet	188	5	5
Cutstone undressed, 472·55 cubic feet	383	14	4
	6,275	8	4

It will be seen that some of these charges can be transferred to the new estimate, with the exception of charge for stones at site and that for conveyance of shafts. This latter is a recent charge and the shafts are for the new gearings. In preparing the new estimate, the piers were taken as they actually were, and provision was made for raising each individually to the height required. Some of these piers had been already raised to a certain height under the old estimate In the new one, provision was made for simply continuing the raising from where it had stopped. The new estimate therefore makes no provision for work done under the old and if the expenditure incurred under the old one be charged to the new estimate, the result will be a large excess of Rs. 4,571.

The new estimate sanctioned in G.O. No. 124 I., dated 24th March 1913 (C.R. No. 81 of 1913–14) for Rs. 57,700 cannot therefore be considered as one superseding

the old estimate, and the only thing that seems to me to be possible is to close the old estimate writing back to the new one the value of the stones at site and the conveyance charges of the shaft as originally contemplated in your No. 1531, dated 17th February 1913. The iron articles, *i.e.*, girders, etc., charged to the old estimate and now lying at site will be treated as surplus materials and disposed of in the manner suggested in this office No. 721-S.E., dated 7th June 1913. I request the favour of your very early orders on the subject.

No. 998-C.E./664 N., dated 10th July 1913.

Forwarded to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation for orders.

2. A reference has been made to the other Executive Engineers in this circle as to whether the girders now lying at site of the regulator are required by them. Their replies are awaited.

S. B. MURRAY,
Superintending Engineer, VI Circle.

V

Memorandum No. 2798/13-1, dated 2nd August 1913.

With reference to his endorsement No. 998-C.E., dated 10th July 1913, regarding the estimate for raising and altering the gearing arrangements of the Peranai regulator, the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, is informed that it is irregular to close the old estimate as suggested by the Executive Engineer, the estimate sanctioned in G.O. No. 244 I., dated 30th April 1913, being in supersession of the estimate sanctioned in 1909. The Superintending Engineer is therefore requested to submit a revised estimate providing for the charges already incurred on the estimate of 1909, with full and clear explanation of the circumstances under which the expenditure on the old estimate of 1909 was incurred and why it was not included in the estimate of Rs. 57,000 submitted with the Superintending Engineer's letter 1579-C.E., dated 27th November 1912.

(By Order.)

F. E. MORGAN,
Asst. Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

To the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle.

VI

Reminder to the Supg. Engr., VI Circle, dated 10th October 1913.
From the „ VI „ „ 21st „ „ No. 1519-C.E./664 N.

VII

Letter—from S. B. MURRAY, Esq., Superintending Engineer, VI Circle.
To—the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
Dated—Trichinopoly, the 8th November 1913.
No.—1615-C.E./664 N.

I have the honour to forward herewith for the sanction of the Government a revised estimate, amounting to Rs. 62,300, for "raising the platform, altering the gearing and roller arrangements and shifting the bridge of the Peranai regulator." The necessity for the revision is explained in the report accompanying the estimate.

ENCLOSURES.

(1)

Report to accompany the revised estimate for "raising the platform, altering the gearing and roller arrangements and shifting the bridge of Peranai regulator."

	RS.
Amount of original estimate	57,700
Do. of revised estimate	62,300
Balance requiring sanction ...	4,600

As the gearings of the lift shutters of the Peranai regulator, Periyār system, were working unsatisfactorily, certain improvements were carried out in 1908–09 to the two shore spans on the right bank of the river. As these improvements were considered satisfactory, an estimate of Rs. 14,000 for altering the gearing arrangements of the remaining eight spans was sanctioned in G.O. No. 266 I., dated 26th June 1909 (Circle Reg. No. 138 of 1909–10). On this estimate an expenditure of Rs. 6,275–8–4 was incurred as detailed below :—

	RS.	A.	P.
(1) Cartage	24	9	0
(2) Maistri's pay	30	0	0
(3) Cement	155	15	4
(4) Conveyance of shafts	50	6	6
(5) Masonry	592	8	0
(6) Iron articles supplied by Workshops and remaining at site.	3,768	6	2
(7) Cutstone dressed at site, 884·38 cubic feet...	1,081	7	7
(8) Cutstone rough, 167·41 cubic feet	188	5	5
(9) Cutstone undressed, 472·55 cubic feet	383	14	4
Total ...	6,275	8	4

When this expenditure had been incurred, work was ordered to be stopped for the reasons given in Chief Engineer's note R.O.C. No. 1292/09, dated 4th February 1913. A fresh estimate of Rs. 57,700 was prepared and sanctioned in G.O. No. 244 I., dated 30th April 1913. This estimate was to supersede the old one, but no provision was made in it for the expenditure incurred under the old one, as when the new estimate was submitted it was presumed that the old estimate would be closed. To make up for this omission this revised estimate is submitted for sanction. It provides for all the charges incurred under the old estimate except those included under items (4), (7), (8) and (9). The shafts included in item (4) were those provided for in the Rs. 57,700 estimate and their conveyance is a proper charge to that estimate. The stone in items (7), (8) and (9) can all be used on the work in building the masonry provided for in the Rs. 57,700 estimate.

---

(2)

Estimate Form—Comparative statement of differences.

Description of work.	Original estimate.			Revised estimate.			More.	Less.	Explanation of difference.
	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Raising the platform, altering the gearing and roller arrangements and shifting the bridge of Peranai regulator.			RS.			RS.	RS.		
Unaffected items as per estimate already sanctioned in G.O. No. 244 I. dated 30th April 1913.	..	..	57,700	..	..	57,700	..	..	
Outlay incurred and charged to old estimate sanctioned for Rs. 14,000 in G.O. No. 266 I., dated 26th June 1909.	..	..	..	..	..	4,572	4572	..	Explanation for the provision of this item is given in the report accompanying the estimate.
Unforeseen works ..	..	..	..	..	..	28	28	..	
Total ..	..	..	57,700	..	..	62,300	4,600	..	
Amount sanctioned in G.O. No. 244 I., dated 30th April 1913.	..	..	..	..	..	57,700	..	..	
Net excess over the original sanction.	..	..	..	..	..	4,600	..	..	

30th October 1913.

M. O'BRIEN,
Executive Engineer, Madura Division.

VIII

Endorsement by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, No. 2798/13-2, dated 3rd December 1913.

Submitted to Government.

2. In the circumstances explained in the report, the revised estimate submitted by the Superintending Engineer in his letter last read above is recommended for sanction.

H. E. CLERK,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

To the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department (Irrigation Branch).

Order—No. 697 I., dated 13th December 1913.

The revised estimate amounting to Rs. 62,300 for "works" or Rs. 75,695 including establishment charges for improvements to the Peranai regulator, Periyâr system, is sanctioned in supersession of the estimate of Rs. 70,971 sanctioned in G.O. No. 244 I., dated 30th April 1913.

2. The sanction accorded in paragraph 1 is registered as No. 132 I. of 1913-14 and will expire on 31st March 1915.

3. Ordered that a copy of these Proceedings be forwarded to the Government of India for information, with reference to their letter No. 520 I., dated 4th April 1913.

[Here enter No. 698 I., dated 13th December 1913.]

(True Extract.)

W. M. ELLIS, Col., R.E.,
Ag. Joint Secretary to Government, P.W.D., Irrigation Branch.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
,, Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, with estimates.
,, Accountant-General.
,, Financial Department.

Endorsement—No. 698 I., dated 13th December 1913.

Forwarded.

(By Order.)

Ag. Joint Secretary to Government, P.W.D., Irrigation Branch.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
(IRRIGATION BRANCH).

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O. Nos. 697–98 I., DATED 13TH DECEMBER 1913.

[SUBJECT.—*Raising and altering the gearing arrangement of the Peranai regulator.*]

From the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, No. 998 *C.E./*664-*N.*, *dated* 10*th July* 1913.

Assistant Chief Engineer for Irrigation—

In G.O. No. 387 I., dated 21st September 1909, sanction was accorded to the estimate of Rs. 14,000 for altering the existing gearing arrangement of the regulator shutters at the Peranai head-works. For reasons stated in the note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, R.C. No. 1292/09, dated 4th February 1913, printed in G.O. No. 124 I., dated 24th February 1913, the above estimate was not worked out and a fresh estimate for Rs. 57,000 in supersession of the previous one was forwarded to the Government of India for sanction India's sanction was communicated in G.O. No. 244 I., dated 30th April 1913.

2. In his letter quoted above, the Superintending Engineer states that an expenditure of Rs. 6,275-8-4 has been incurred under the sanction conveyed in G.O. No. 387 I, dated 21st September 1909, that a portion of this amount may be charged to the estimate now sanctioned and, if so, the excess will be Rs. 4,571. From paragraph 1 of the note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation printed in G.O. No. 124 I., dated 24th February 1913, it will be seen that the Superintending Engineer was asked not to carry out the work sanctioned in G.O. No. 387 I., dated 21st September 1909. As however expenditure has been incurred on the work, the Superintending Engineer may be asked to submit a revised estimate when the work is in an advanced stage. For orders.

S.A.V.—22-7-13.

3. In the Executive Engineer's letter now submitted it is stated "some of the "piers had been already raised to a certain height under the old estimate. In the "new one, provision was made for simply continuing the raising from where it had "stopped, etc., etc." But this fact was not made clear either in the estimate of Rs. 57,000 submitted by the Superintending Engineer or in the report accompanying it. It was therefore naturally thought that no work was done under the old estimate as was instructed by this office. It does not seem proper to close the old estimate separately as suggested by the Executive Engineer. The proper course is to call on the Superintending Engineer to submit a revised estimate under paragraph 675 of the Public Works Department Code. The revised estimate can be sanctioned by the Local Government as the excess is within 10 per cent. of the original estimate (*vide* paragraph 1919-V. (*c*) of the Public Works Department Code, Volume II).

M.S.V.—23-7-13.

P.R.—24-7-13.

Chief Engineer for Irrigation—

As the Executive Engineer had incurred certain expenditure on the estimate sanctioned in 1909, he should have either submitted an estimate in supersession of this or a revised estimate.

It is submitted that the Superintending Engineer be asked to submit a revised estimate to that sanctioned in G.O. No. 244 I., dated 30th April 1913, and in supersession of G.O. No. 387 I., dated 21st September 1909, with full reasons for doing so.

F. E. Morgan—28-7-13.

H. E. Clerk—28-7-13.

Assistant Chief Engineer for Irrigation—

A draft memorandum to Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, is submitted, which, if approved, may issue.

A.V.S.—30-7-13.

F.E.M.—31-7-13.

[Issued as G.O. No. 2798/13-I, dated 2nd August 1913.]

Manager, Office of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation—

A reminder to Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, is put up for approval.

M.S.V.—6-10-13.

M.S.V.—6-10-13.

P.K.S—6-10-13.

Reminder to the Supg. Engr., VI Circle, dated 10*th October* 1913.

From the „ „ *VI* „ *No.* 1509/664, *dated* 21*st October* 1913.

Assistant Chief Enginineer for Irrigation—

Submitted.

Lie over till 1st December 1913.

S.A.V.—23-10-13.

M.S.V.—23-10-13.

F.E.M.—25-10-13.

From the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, No. 1615 *C.E.*/664-*N., dated* 8*th November* 1913.

Assistant Chief Engineer for Irrigation—

In their letter No. 520 I., dated 4th/9th April 1913, the Government of India sanctioned an estimate of Rs. 57,700 (for "works") for raising the platform, altering the gearing and rollers, and shifting the bridge of the Peranai regulator, Periyār system (*vide* G.O. No. 244 I., dated 30th April 1913). The Superintending Engineer now submits a revised estimate amounting to Rs. 62,300 which shows an excess of 7·4 per cent. on the sanctioned estimate. The necessity for the revision of the original estimate is explained in the Executive Engineer's report accompanying the Superintending Engineer's letter. Orders are requested whether the estimate may be checked for sanction.

G.O. No. 244 I., dated 30th April 1913.

I think the Chief Engineer for Irrigation called for this revised estimate but I do not see the call in the file.

F.E.M.

2. The revised estimate is within the sanctioning powers of the Local Government—*vide* paragraph 1919—V (*c*) of the Public Works Department Code, Volume II.

T.S.R.—12-11-13.

A.V.S.—12-11-13.

Chief Engineer for Irrigation--

As the Executive Engineer had incurred certain expenditure on the estimate sanctioned in 1909, he should have either submitted an estimate in supersession of this or a revised estimate.

It is submitted that the Superintending Engineer be asked to submit a revised estimate to that sanctioned in G.O. No. 244 I., dated 30th April 1913, and in supersession of G.O. No. 387 I., dated 21st September 1909, with full reasons for doing so.

F. E. Morgan—28-7-13.

H. E. Clerk—28-7-13.

Assistant Chief Engineer for Irrigation—

A draft memorandum to Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, is submitted, which, if approved, may issue.

A.V.S.—30-7-13.

F.E.M.—31-7-13.

[Issued as G.O. No. 2798/13-1, dated 2nd August 1913.]

Manager, Office of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation —

A reminder to Superintending Engineer, VI Circle; is put up for approval.

M.S.V.—6-10-13.

M.S.V.—6-10-13.

P.K.S—6-10-13.

Reminder to the Supg. Engr., VI Circle, dated 10*th October* 1913.

From the „ „ *VI* „ *No.* 1509/664, *dated* 21*st October* 1913.

Assistant Chief Enginineer for Irrigation—

Submitted.

Lie over till 1st December 1913.

S.A.V.—23-10-13.

M.S.V.—23-10-13.

F.E.M.—25-10-13.

From the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, No. 1615 *C.E./*664-*N., dated* 8*th November* 1913.

Assistant Chief Engineer for Irrigation—

In their letter No. 520 I., dated 4th/9th April 1913, the Government of India sanctioned an estimate of Rs. 57,700 (for "works") for raising the platform, altering the gearing and rollers, and shifting the bridge of the Peranai regulator, Periyār system (*vide* G.O. No. 244 I., dated 30th April 1913). The Superintending Engineer now submits a revised estimate amounting to Rs. 62,300 which shows an excess of 7·4 per cent. on the sanctioned estimate. The necessity for the revision of the original estimate is explained in the Executive Engineer's report accompanying the Superintending Engineer's letter. Orders are requested whether the estimate may be checked for sanction.

G.O. No. 244 I., dated 30th April 1913.

I think the Chief Engineer for Irrigation called for this revised estimate but I do not see the call in the file.

F.E.M.

2. The revised estimate is within the sanctioning powers of the Local Government —*vide* paragraph 1919—V (*c*) of the Public Works Department Code, Volume II.

T.S.R.—12-11-13.

A.V.S.—12-11-13.

Chief Engineer for Irrigation—

No explanation has been given as to why no allowance is made for items (3) and (6), page 4 of Government Order.

Possibly item (3) was used in item (5).

F.E.M.—13-11-13.

Check.

Items (3) and (6) were probably used on the new work.

H.E.C.—13-11-13.

Technical Section (through *F.E.I.*)—

A.V.S.—13-11-13.

M.S.V.—14-11-13.

F.E.I.—

There is nothing to check in detail in this revised estimate. A portion of the actual expenditure incurred to the extent of Rs. 4,600 on the estimate sanctioned in G.O. No. 387 I., dated 21st September 1909, which was omitted to be included in the revised estimate of Rs. 57,700 sanctioned in G.O. No. 244 I., dated 30th April 1913, has now been included in the re-revised estimate submitted by the Superintending Engineer.

M.V.—2-12-13.

R.S.—2-12-13.

Under Secretary—

Secretary—

An endorsement by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation and a draft order sanctioning the revised estimate are submitted which, if approved, may be forwarded to Financial for acceptance.

S.A.V.—3-12-13.

M.S.V.—3-12-13.

F.E.M.—3-12-13.

H.E.C.—3-12-13.

To the Financial Department u.o.

Financial Department.

Submitted that the draft may be accepted.

V.G.K.—8-12-13.

C. Reilly—8-12 13.

To the Public Works Department (Irrigation) u.o.

Public Works Department
(Irrigation Branch).

Under Secretary—

The draft may issue.

S.A.V.—10-12-13.

M.S.V.—10-12-13.

Issue.

F.E.M.—10-12-13.

[**Issued** as G.O. Nos. 697-98 I., dated 13th December 1913.]

Urgent

CR 2125 11 OCT 1913 SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE ... TRICHINOPOLY

CR PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT. Cl

Irrigation Branch.

No. 1529 / 664 (M) 821.10.13

1 REMINDER. 2798/13

To The Supt. Engineer
Sixth circle

REPLY.

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION 23 OCT 1913 No. 4782/13

To

THE CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION,

Madras.

pp 4-5 cf

THE undersigned has the honour to invite attention to the ~~Order~~ Memo ~~R.O.C.~~* No. 2798/13-1 dated 2nd August 1913 and to request that this reminder may be returned at once with information in the margin as to—

(1) the stage at which the matter now is, &

(2) the date by which a reply may be expected, ~~and~~

~~(3) the circumstances which have caused the delay.~~

P. K. Subbaraya
6.10.13

MADRAS,

10-10-1913.

for *Chief Engineer for Irrigation.*

* *Subject.*

Improvements to the Peranai Regulator, Periyar System

Requesting to submit a revised estimate for the work — providing for the charges already incurred on the estimate of 1909, with the necessary explanations

The Executive Engineer has made a reference to the General Supply & Stores & is awaiting his reply

[signature]
18.10.13
Supdg. Engr.
Sixth Circle

Rec. 16/10/13

[initials]
6/10/13

10

pp 1-3 c.f. From the S.E. VI. No. 998 C.E. / 664R dated 10.7.13

" 4-5 " To do — Memo 2798/13-1 dated 2.8.13

Quote { " 6 " To the do Pr dated 10.10.13

1118

From do — 1519 C.E. / 664 R dated 21.10.13

7-9 From do — 1615-C.E. / 664 R dated 8.11.13

Endt: by E.S. 2798/13-2 dated 3.12.13

R.P.D.

Record not for Comparative

Submitted to Govt:

2. In the circumstances explained in the report the revised estimate submitted by the S.E. in his letter last read above is recommended for sanction.

Mac
3.12.13

[signature] 3/12/13

To

The Secy: to Govt:
P.W.D. (I)

6874

[signature]
3.12.13

13

Scott. II—10 (a)—7,000—4-13.

DEPARTMENT.

Improvements to the Peranai Regulator.
Periyar System.
Sanctioning a revised estimate amounting to Rs. 75695/- inclusive of establishment charges for
and ordering that a copy of the proofs be forwarded to the Govt. of India

Regulator, Project. Estimates.

READ AGAIN G.O. No. 3879, dated 21. 8. 1912.
" " " " 124-25 I, " 24. 2 1913.
2449 30. 4. 1913.

READ ALSO:—

C. No. , From the C.E., No. 2798/13-2, dated 3. 12 1913.

" " , " " , " " , " 191 .

" " , " " , " " , " 191 .

ORDER. No. 697 I, dated 13 December 1913.

Press.

Print N.t.s

Cost debitable to "49. Imperial"

The revised estimate amounting to Rs 62,300/ for "Works" or Rs 75,695/ including establishment charges for Improvements to the Peranai regulator Periyar System is sanctioned in supersession of the estimate of Rs 70,971 sanctioned in G.O. No. 2449 of 30.4.13.

2 The sanction accorded in para 1 is registered as No. 132 I of 1913-14 and will expire on 31.3.15

[illegible]

148

3 Ordered that a copy of these Proceedings be forwarded to the Govt: of India for information with ref: to their Letter No 5209 d/4.4.13.

H. E. D/18.12.13 Dec 13

Endorsement forwarded ✓ D 13/2/14

Reprinted in Ro 2441 D d/30.4.13 — S

Print notes

mare
3.12.13

[illegible] 3/12/13 AH 3/12/13

E. D ✓ } D 18/12/13
S. E VI with estimates } McD 18/2/14
A. G. ✓ } D 18/2/14
Revl Dept }

[illegible] 3.12.13

617-V

3

1580
158